

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant sincerely thanks the Examiner for his remarks as provided in the outstanding Office Action of 18 February 2009.

Request for Supervisory Review

This application, in being up for its third (or later) office action, is desired of its prosecution to be concluded. In this regard, Applicant respectfully requests for review of this application by a supervisory Examiner, as recommended under MPEP 707.02.

Request for Examiner's Answer to Material Previously Traversed (MPEP 707.07(f))

In Applicant's response of 18 January 2009, Applicant traversed the Examiner's position with regard to claim 6, and the Examiner's reliance on Baldwin (US 5,600,358) cited in support of official notice.

Applicant's review of the present Office Action fails to find an answer to Applicant's above traversal. The Examiner's answer to Applicant's above traversal is respectfully requested.

35 USC §103(a)

Independent claim 1 remains rejected under §103(a) over the combination of Suzuki (US 5,847,836) in view of Yuen (US 6,347,863). Claim 1 was previously amended to additionally recite that the elongate ink reservoir assembly defines at least three ink reservoirs, and each of the at least three ink reservoirs spans a width of the printing path.

Regarding the above feature, Applicant regrets that Applicant is not entirely clear on how the Examiner is relying on the cited references to reject claim 1. Specifically, Applicant is unclear if:

1. The Examiner contends that Suzuki discloses an elongate ink reservoir assembly spanning a width of the printing path, but that this elongate ink reservoir assembly contains only two ink reservoirs. Hence, reliance is being made on Yuen which discloses three ink reservoirs; or
2. The Examiner contends that Suzuki discloses an elongate ink reservoir assembly, but that this ink reservoir assembly does not span the width of the printing path. Hence, reliance is made on Yuen which the Examiner asserts "*span the entire width of the ink reservoir assembly (50)*".

In consideration of the Examiner's remarks as provided in the 2nd paragraph of page 3 of the instant Office Action, which does not explicitly assert that Suzuki discloses an elongate ink reservoir assembly spanning a width of the printing path, Applicant is adopting interpretation 2 above.

With reference to the Examiner's interpretation of Yuen, Applicant notes that the Examiner asserts that Yuen, in Fig. 3, allegedly discloses an ink reservoir assembly with three ink reservoirs contained therein, wherein each of the three ink reservoirs span the entire width of the ink reservoir assembly (page 5, paragraph 2, of Office Action).

Applicant however points out that claim 1 requires each of the at least three ink reservoirs to span a width of the printing path, and not the ink reservoir assembly *per se*.

Fig. 3 of Yuen illustrates an ink cartridge for a conventional scanning-type printer. The ink reservoirs of the cartridge, even if they span a width of the ink reservoir assembly, do not span a width of the printing path as required by claim 1.

More specifically, it is noted that the Examiner has considered the “printing path” as being the total space between both ends of the platen assembly (i.e. in the direction of a → until the end of the platen assembly, and in the direction of ← until the end of the platen assembly). The ink cartridge of Yuen, as illustrated in Fig. 3, clearly does not span this width and therefore the ink reservoirs cannot span the width of the printing path.

It is hence submitted that Yuen fails to prejudice the above feature of claim 1 regarding each of the at least three elongate ink reservoirs spanning the entire width of the ink reservoir assembly.

Turning to Suzuki, Suzuki, at col. 16, lines 24-30, describes only that an ink tank can be integrally arranged on the printhead itself. Suzuki is otherwise completely silent as to the ink tank spanning a width of the printing path, or to any other characteristic of the ink tank.

The combination of Suzuki and Yuen therefore fails to render obvious the feature of claim 1, regarding each of the at least three elongate ink reservoirs spanning a width of the printing path. Moreover, even if invention of Suzuki were modified to include the ink reservoir of Yuen, the resultant combination still would not arrive at the invention of claim 1.

With regard to the Examiner’s stated motivation to combine Suzuki with Yuen, the Examiner states that one would have been motivated to modify the elongate ink reservoir assembly of Suzuki with the ink reservoir assembly of Yuen so as to form an elongate ink reservoir assembly defining at least three ink reservoirs for storing ink, each of the at least three ink reservoirs spanning a width of the printing path.

For reasons as provided above, Applicant traverses this assertion since neither Suzuki nor Yuen teach or suggest ink reservoirs which span a width of the printing path.

In the same statement, the Examiner further asserts that one would have been motivated to make the above modification for the advantage of providing an ink reservoir assembly that has an extended useful life. Applicant also traverses this assertion.

The fact that the ink cartridge of Yuen has an ink reservoir that spans a width of the ink reservoir assembly is irrelevant to the alleged advantage of providing an ink reservoir assembly that has an extended useful life.

The advantage of an extended useful life is obtained in Yuen by the provision of a replacement top portion for an original cartridge. The dimensions of the ink reservoir are characteristics of the original cartridge, do not in any way contribute to obtaining this advantage.

Put differently, modifying the ink reservoirs of Suzuki so as to have the dimensions of the ink reservoirs of Yuen, does not provide Suzuki with the advantage of an extended useful

life. Therefore, the Examiner's asserted motivation for combining Suzuki with Yuen is respectfully submitted to be untenable.

For reasons as provided above, the pending claims are maintained as novel and inventive over the cited combination of references. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully sought.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:



Kia Silverbrook

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762